PLOS MEDICINE

CORRECTION

Correction: Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A living systematic review and meta-analysis

The *PLOS Medicine* Staff

The third bullet under the "What did the researchers do and find?" section of the Author Summary is incorrect. The publisher apologizes for this error.

The correct text is: Across all meta-analyzed studies, when Ag-RDTs were performed according to manufacturers' recommendations, they showed a sensitivity of 76.3% (95% CI 73.1% to 79.2%), with LumiraDx (sensitivity 88.2% [95% CI 59.0% to 97.5%]) and, of the instrument-free Ag-RDTs, Standard Q nasal (80.2% sensitivity [95% CI 70.3% to 87.4%]) performing best.

Reference

1. Brümmer LE, Katzenschlager S, Gaeddert M, Erdmann C, Schmitz S, Bota M, et al. (2021) Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS Med 18(8): e1003735. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003735 PMID: 34383750

Citation: The *PLOS Medicine* Staff (2021) Correction: Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS Med 18(10): e1003825. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003825

Published: October 13, 2021